



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JANUARY MEETING, 1885.

The usual meeting was held on Thursday, the 8th instant; Dr. GEORGE E. ELLIS in the chair. The President was again absent in consequence of ill-health; but the Society was glad to learn that he was much better, and that there was reason to believe that he would, in time, resume his place at its meetings.

The Recording Secretary read his report of the doings of the last meeting.

The Librarian submitted the list of donors to the Library.

The Corresponding Secretary stated that Dr. Edward Channing had accepted his election as a Resident Member.

The following letter from Mr. Francis Parkman was then read by Dr. ELLIS:—

HON. ROBERT C. WINTHROP,

President of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

DEAR SIR,—I enclose herewith a list of historical manuscripts relating to the French in America, which I beg to offer to the Society under the following conditions:—

The collection, together with such additions as I may hereafter make to it, is to be kept together, and is to be called The Parkman Collection.

I shall have the right of taking any part of it from the Library for consultation, the same to be returned when its purpose is answered.

Respectfully yours,

FRANCIS PARKMAN.

BOSTON, Jan. 8, 1885.

List of Manuscripts given to the Massachusetts Historical Society by Francis Parkman, Jan. 8, 1885.

A collection marked CANADA, 1674-1712	8 vols.
A collection marked NEW FRANCE, 1741-1761	12 "
Contents of the last-named collection, unbound.	
Copies from the Bouquet and Haldimand Papers, 1756-1761	1 "
Copies from the Public Record Office, 1753-1760	4 "
Letters of Lieutenant-Governor Dinwiddie, 1751-1755	5 "
Letters of Montcalm to his Family, 1756-1759	1 "
Letters of Montcalm to Bourlamaque, 1756-1759	1 "

Letters of Vaudreuil and others to Bourlamaque	1 vol.
Copies from the Archives Nationales, 1666-1759	1 "
Histoire de Montreal, par Dollier de Casson, 1640-1672	1 "
Letters of Washington to Colonel Bouquet, 1758, unbound.	
Supplement to Papers from Public Record Office, "	
Thirty-five volumes and three unbound sets of papers.	

All of the above papers are copies from the original documents, and, with a few exceptions, they have never been printed.

The collection in eight volumes, marked CANADA, was made in 1872 and 1873, and consists of copies of original documents in the various archives of Paris, chiefly those of the Marine and Colonies.

The collection in twelve volumes, marked NEW FRANCE, was begun in 1874, and consists of documents of later date than the former, drawn from the same sources. Both of these collections are, in the main, additional and supplementary to the Paris Documents copied under the direction of Mr. Brodhead for the State of New York. The Brodhead collection was made with reference to the history of that State, while the two collections just mentioned were made with reference to the history of Canada and its dependencies.

The selections of papers from the Public Record Office at London, forming four volumes, were made in 1880 and 1881.

The selections from the Bouquet and Haldimand Papers in the British Museum were made in 1880.

The letters of Lieutenant-Governor Dinwiddie, in five volumes, were copied in the same year, at London, from Dinwiddie's letter-books. Most of these have since been printed.

The letters written by Montcalm, when in America, to his wife and mother, were copied in 1869 from the autographs in the possession of his great-grandson, the present Marquis of Montcalm.

The letters of Montcalm to Bourlamaque were copied from the autographs in the possession of the heirs of the late Sir Thomas Phillips. I had known of the existence of these letters for about fifteen years, but could not succeed in discovering them till the summer of 1880.

The letters of Vaudreuil, Lévis, and others to Bourlamaque were copied at the same time from autographs also in the hands of the heirs of Sir Thomas Phillips.

The collection of papers from the Archives Nationales at Paris was made about ten years ago.

The History of Montreal by Dollier de Casson was copied from the original manuscript at the Mazarin Library, at Paris.

The letters of Washington to Colonel Bouquet were copied in 1880 from the autographs in the Bouquet Collection, British Museum (vol. 21,641, *Additional Manuscripts*). Several of these letters have been printed by Dr. Sparks with considerable variations, probably due to his

having taken them from Washington's letter-books, without having seen the original draughts.

The various collections mentioned above form a part of the series of manuscripts collected by me since the year 1845 to illustrate the history of the French on this continent.

F. PARKMAN.

JAN. 8, 1885.

Mr. PARKMAN, by request, then made some interesting remarks in regard to these volumes; and when he had finished, Dr. ELLIS said that something more than a customary vote of thanks was due from the Society for this important and valuable gift; and accordingly it was voted that a committee, consisting of Dr. Ellis, Mr. Winsor, and Dr. Green, be appointed to report and make suitable acknowledgment to the donor.

Dr. ELLIS presented eight volumes and an atlas of stars, containing the results of the labors of nearly thirteen years by Dr. Benjamin Apthorp Gould in the National Observatory of the Argentine Republic.

Mr. ROBERT C. WINTHROP, Jr., communicated the following paper which his father had prepared for the preceding meeting:—

During the late visit to New York, which, much to my regret, cost me the satisfaction of being present at our last meeting, I spent an hour at the Metropolitan Museum in Central Park, in looking at the interesting pictures of the eminent English artist, George Frederic Watts, which have been brought over from London for exhibition. I do not pretend to be a judge of his allegorical and mythical pictures, of which there are many in most glowing and gorgeous coloring. But I cannot forbear from advising every one to pay a visit to the portraits; and I should hope that our Museum of Art might obtain them for exhibition in Boston, and save us all the trouble of a journey to New York. The portraits are certainly of a very high order, and are of the most distinguished men of the time,—such as Cardinal Manning and the late Lord Lawrence, Tennyson and Browning, Carlyle and Stuart Mill, the Duke of Argyll and the Marquis of Salisbury, Swinburne and Burne Jones, not forgetting our own Motley as a young man of

twenty-five. Watts's great portrait of Gladstone, which I had the good fortune to see in London, was regarded as too precious to be exposed to the perils of an ocean voyage. I recall, too, his marvellous portrait of Dean Milman which is not at New York. But the portraits which are there are full of interest, both from their subjects and as works of art; and I should be sorry to think that they would not find their way to Boston for exhibition.

Since my return home I have received an appeal from the Art Committee of the Union League Club of New York, on the subject of the present tariff on all foreign works of art. It was accompanied by a petition to Congress that the duties might be restored to their old rate, or abolished altogether; and I was requested to obtain authority for signing it in behalf of this Society. But while I sympathize generally in the views of this petition, I can hardly regard it as a matter for our consideration or action, and I do not propose to make it an exception to my rule by signing it personally. But I lay the papers on the table for the signatures of any members who may be disposed to examine or sign such a petition.

Many months ago, there was kindly sent to me a copy of an article in the "New York Independent," written by our accomplished Corresponding Member, Dr. Benson J. Lossing, on the subject of celebrating the fourth centennial of the discovery of America. The date of that discovery by Columbus is given by Mr. Lossing as the 12th of October, 1492. There are thus somewhat more than seven years to elapse before the fourth centennial will occur. But it seems that consultations have already been held, both in Spain and in our own land, as to the mode and as to the place in which that supreme historical event shall be commemorated. The article of Mr. Lossing gives an interesting account of the views which have already been expressed by King Alphonso and some of his ministers, by the Duke of Veragua, who represents the family of Columbus, and by Emilio Castelar, the eminent orator and republican statesman of Spain. They all think that the celebration should be in Spain. Mr. Lossing, on the other hand, claims that New York, as "the acknowledged commercial metropolis of the New World," is the most appropriate place for a grand international celebration; and I heartily concur with him.

But a celebration at New York, however grand, is not all that is due to Columbus from America. His memory, with that of his great compeers, has been too long neglected in our large cities. No adequate memorial of the discoverer of the New World is to be found anywhere on this continent. In a lecture delivered before this Society on my return from Europe, in 1869, I ventured to call attention to this omission, as follows:—

“A noble monument to Columbus, recently finished, surmounted by a striking statue of him, and adorned by a series of bas-reliefs illustrating the strange, eventful history of his life,—from which, I need hardly say, the discovery of America was not wholly omitted,—greeted us at the gates of Genoa, with the simple inscription in Italian, ‘To Christopher Columbus, from his Country;’ and as I gazed upon it with admiration, I could not help feeling that it was not there alone that a monument and a statue were due to his memory, but that upon the shores of our own hemisphere, too, there ought to be some worthy memorial of the discoverer of the New World.”

More recently, in the Centennial Oration which I delivered at the call of the Mayor and City Council of Boston, on the 4th of July, 1876, I used the following language: “From the hour when Columbus and his compeers discovered our continent, its ultimate political destiny was fixed. At the very gateway of the Pantheon of American liberty and American independence might well be seen a triple monument,—like that to the old inventors of printing at Frankfort,—including Columbus and Americus Vesputius and Cabot. They were the pioneers in the march to Independence. They were the precursors in the only progress of freedom which was to have no backward steps. Liberty had struggled long and bravely in other ages and in other lands. It had made glorious manifestations of its power and promise in Athens and in Rome, in the mediæval republics of Italy, on the plains of Germany, along the dykes of Holland, among the icy fastnesses of Switzerland, and, more securely and hopefully still, in the sea-girt isle of Old England. But it was the glory of those heroic old navigators to reveal a standing-place for it at last, where its lever could find a secure fulcrum and rest safely until it had moved the world!”

For the execution of such a triple monument, including the statues of Columbus, Americus Vesputius, and Sebastian Cabot, not one of our accomplished artists, at home or abroad, would find the seven intervening years too long a time. Portraits of all three of the great discoverers are to be found in the galleries abroad, or copies of them in our own galleries. I believe that the original of Sebastian Cabot was destroyed by some accident; but there is a careful copy of it on our own stairway, and another in the gallery of the Historical Society of New York. Copley Square would be a most eligible place for such a monument, if it is not previously appropriated; and its surroundings, including the new Public Library and the Museum of Art, would be in excellent keeping with it.

I cannot but wish that the Museum of Art, with our own Society and the American Antiquarian Society, would take this memorial seriously and seasonably in hand; and I cannot doubt that contributions to cover the cost could be obtained from time to time before the money is needed.

But I content myself with renewing the suggestion, in the hope that it may attract the interest of others before it is too late.

Before concluding these introductory remarks, I present to the Library, in behalf of Miss Mary Fraser Curtis, a pamphlet which came to her from her grandfather, the late Hon. Daniel Sargent. It contains the well-remembered correspondence between the late John Quincy Adams and several citizens of Massachusetts of the old Federal party, of which Mr. Sargent was one, concerning the charge of a design to dissolve the Union, alleged to have existed in this State. There is a copy of this pamphlet in our Library already; and the contents of it are included, with much additional and illustrative matter, in the volume entitled "New England Federalism," published by Mr. Henry Adams in 1877. But this copy has an interest and a value as having the autograph signatures of all the gentlemen who signed the paper, — Harrison Gray Otis, Israel Thorndike, Thomas H. Perkins, William Prescott, Daniel Sargent, John Lowell, William Sullivan, Charles Jackson, Warren Dutton, Benjamin Pickman, Henry Cabot, son of George Cabot, Charles C. Parsons, son of Theophilus Parsons, and Franklin Dexter, son of Samuel Dexter. Thirteen more notable autograph signatures could hardly be found together anywhere, and the

pamphlet may well find a place among the specialties of our collection.

In turning over the leaves of this pamphlet, in which it had probably been used as a mark, I found a little remembrancer of a later day, — one of the votes of the old Whig party in 1836, with the electors of President headed by Nathaniel Silsbee, with Edward Everett for Governor, and with a list of no less than seventy-four candidates for the General Court of Massachusetts. My own name stands third on the list, and I think there are only three or four others living of the whole seventy-four. This old vote may well accompany the pamphlet in which I found it.

Our grateful acknowledgments will be returned to Miss Curtis for this gift.

Judge CHAMBERLAIN made some observations respecting Samuel Maverick's palisade house of 1630, referred to in the Maverick Manuscript, recently discovered in the British Museum, and said: —

It has been generally supposed that Samuel Maverick, assisted by David Thompson, who gave his name to an island in Boston Bay, some time before 1628 erected on Noddle's Island a house protected by palisades and fortified by guns; and that it was in this house that Governor Winthrop and his party were entertained by Maverick when they first came to Boston Harbor from Salem, June 17, 1630.

The sole authority for the erection of such a house on Noddle's Island, and for its existence when Winthrop arrived, is Edward Johnson, in Chap. XVII. of his "Wonder-Working Providence." There being nothing improbable in his account, it has been followed without question by Prince, Hutchinson, Savage, Young, Drake, Frothingham, and many others. But there are facts which seem to be inconsistent with Johnson's statement, though no one of them, nor perhaps all of them combined, is sufficient to overthrow it. Lately, however, additional evidence has come to light, and I now propose to state the whole case. Johnson's narrative is as follows: —

"But to go on with the story, the 12 of July or thereabout 1630, the soldiers of Christ first set foot on this Western end of the World; where arriving in safety, both men, women and children. On the North side

of the Charles River, they landed near a small island, called Noddel's Island, where one Mr. Samuel Maverick then living, a man of a very loving and courteous behavior, very ready to entertain strangers, yet an enemy to the Reformation in hand, being strong for the lordly prelatical power, on this island, he had built a small Fort with the help of one Mr. David Thompson, placing therein four Murderers to protect him from the Indians. About one mile distant upon the River ran a small creek, taking its name from Major Gen. Edward Gibbons, who dwelt there for some years after. On the South side of the River on a point of land called Blackstone's point, planted Mr. William Blackstone, of whom we have formerly spoken. To the southeast of him, near an island called Thompson's Island lived some few planters more. These persons were the first planters of those parts, having some small trading with the Indians for beaver skins, which moved them to make their abode in those parts whom these first troops of Christ's army found as fit helps to further their work."

This account of the coming of Winthrop's fleet, and of the topography of Boston and its vicinity, as well as of the persons he found there, is so incomplete and inaccurate that it raises at once a question as to the authority of Johnson's book on matters apart from his chief purpose, — the history of the planting of churches in New England, — or only incidental thereto. It was written between 1647 and 1651, and published in London in 1654. Savage's opinion of it as authority may be gathered from his notes to Winthrop's Journal, vol. i. pp. 8, 100, 112. I have looked through its pages, though not exhaustively, and have noticed some errors not creditable to a historian who came in 1630, and was engaged in public affairs during his subsequent life. In Chap. VII. he misdescribes the bounds of the colony, and the reservation of mines to the king. In Chap. XVII. he errs by a month as to the date of Winthrop's arrival, and in Chap. XXV. by more than a year as to the death of Sagamore John and his people by small-pox. In Chap. XVII. he tells us that the first court was held on board the "Arbella," which possibly may have been, though Savage doubts it; and that Winthrop and others were chosen officers for the remainder of the year 1630, — a fact nowhere else mentioned, and contradicted negatively by the absence of any such statement in the place of all others where it would be looked for, the official records of the transactions of that court. In the same chapter he asserts that in 1630 about one hundred

and ten persons were admitted freemen. The record says that in October of that year about the same number expressed a desire to be so admitted, but that their request was not granted until May of the next year.

If Johnson were our sole authority respecting the voyage of Winthrop's fleet, his reader could confidently assert that after leaving Yarmouth in the Isle of Wight it came directly into Boston Harbor, and the company first landed about July 12, instead of disembarking at Salem on the 12th of June.

And if we attempt to construct the topography of Boston and its vicinity according to Johnson's description of it, we have one river, the Charles, instead of two, the other being the Mystic; and into the Charles runs Gibbons's Creek, on which he resided many years. On the south side of the river, and opposite to Gibbons's plantation, we should look for Blackstone's Point in Boston. The utter confusion of Johnson's topography is apparent when we place Gibbons where he actually resided, up Mystic River, in the "Charlestown Fields," now Everett, and where his creek runs to this day.¹ Johnson's account, quoted above, was written more than fifteen years after the time to which it relates; and its untrustworthiness is more clearly manifest when compared with Dudley's narrative covering the same period, addressed to the Countess of Lincoln; and its misleading character appears by observing that even the careful and accurate Young, following Johnson, makes Gibbons's Creek tributary to the Charles.²

In like manner he gives us an incomplete account of the old planters. He names Maverick, Gibbons, Blackstone, and Thompson, but says nothing of those found at Winnisimmet as early as 1626, nor of Walford and his palisadoed house at Charlestown, nor of the Spragues and the remnant of the hundred planters who, Higginson says, were there in 1629.³

A writer of this description can hardly be deemed an authority on any controverted point; and yet he is the sole authority, so far as I have observed, that places any residence whatsoever on Noddle's Island before 1635.

I now bring together those facts which lead me to believe

¹ Memorial History of Boston, vol. ii. p. 387; Third Report of the Record Commissioners, *passim*; Frothingham's History of Charlestown, pp. 59, 80.

² Chronicles of Massachusetts, pp. 312, 384 note.

³ Frothingham's History of Charlestown, pp. 18, 19.

that Samuel Maverick's fortified house was at Winnisimmet, and not at Noddle's Island, as is asserted by Johnson; and that it was at Winnisimmet he entertained Winthrop and his party, June 17, on his first visit to Boston Bay.

In the first place, Samuel Maverick and John Blackleach, joint-owners of that part of Winnisimmet which does not now belong to the United States, sold the same to Richard Beltingham, Feb. 27, 1635, as appears from "Suffolk Deeds," lib. i. fol. 15, the fuller bounds of which will be found in the "Second Report of the Record Commissioners," p. 57. That part now owned by the United States Maverick seems to have owned exclusively, as some years later he sold a portion of it to William Stitson. And inasmuch as there is no evidence of any conveyance or allotment of that plantation to them or to any other party, the presumption is that before the coming of Winthrop they had acquired a title to it, which was respected by the new government.

In the second place, Samuel Maverick had a house at Winnisimmet as early as Aug. 16, 1631, a little more than a year after he entertained Winthrop. This is clear from the following record:—

"August 16, 1631. It is ordered, that Mr. Shepheard and Robert Coles shall be fined five marks apiece, and Edward Gibbons twenty shillings for abusing themselves disorderly with drinking too much strong drink aboard the Friendship, and at Mr. Maverick his house at Winnisimmet."¹

He was living there in December, 1633.

"John Sagamore died of the small pox, and almost all his people; above thirty buried by Mr. Maverick of Winnisimmet in one day, . . . Among others, Mr. Maverick of Winnisimmet is worthy of perpetual remembrance. Himself, his wife and servants, went daily to them, ministered to their necessities, and buried their dead, and took away many of their children."²

Who was "Mr. Maverick of Winnisimmet"? Besides the Rev. John Maverick, of Dorchester, there were three men of the name of Maverick,—Samuel, Elias, and Moses, who were admitted freemen, respectively, in 1632, 1633, and 1634. Samuel

¹ Mass. Col. Rec., vol. i. p. 90.

² Savage's Winthrop's Journal, vol. i. pp. 142, 143.

and Elias, it is almost certain, were brothers; and both lived at Winnisimmet, and on the same estate, — now the property of the United States. But there was only one “Mr. Maverick,” and he was Mr. Samuel Maverick. In saying this, I exclude the Rev. Mr. John Maverick, of Dorchester.

Uniformly and without exception, both in the Colony Records and in Winthrop’s Journal, Samuel Maverick is called “Mr. Maverick;” nor is Elias or Moses ever so called until a much later period. At that time “Mr.” was not only a mark of rank, but of seniority as well; it was an absolute, as well as a relative term.

There being, therefore, only one “Mr. Maverick,” let us assume for a moment that he lived on Noddle’s Island instead of at Winnisimmet, and then consider the likelihood of “himself, his wife and his servants going daily” in a skiff over the half-frozen bay between Noddle’s Island and Winnisimmet in December weather to minister to the dying Indians.

We are absolutely certain that there was a house at Winnisimmet in 1631; and there are some reasons which indicate that neither at that time nor for some time after was there any residence at Noddle’s Island. If Maverick had a fortified house at Noddle’s Island in 1630, as Johnson asserts, it must have been well known to all people, certainly to Winthrop and the members of his family; and yet within six months after Maverick is thought to have entertained the Governor there, “three of his servants coming in a shallop from Mistic, — Dec. 24, 1630, — were driven upon Noddle’s Island, and forced to stay there all that night, without fire or food.”¹ The reader is ready to ask why they did not seek shelter and food in the hospitable house of Samuel Maverick.

If Maverick before 1630 had built a house on Noddle’s Island, under a claim of right, and was living there in April, 1632, the order of the General Court of that date is at least singular. Why should he be excluded, on his own estate, from “shooting at fowls,” or from taking them with nets, and the exclusive privilege of those acts be given to one John Perkins?²

As we have seen, Maverick had a house at Winnisimmet as early as August, 1631. In the previous October, within four

¹ Winthrop’s Journal, vol. i. p. 47.

² Mass. Col. Rec., vol. i. p. 95.

months after Winthrop's visit, he, Dudley, and Maverick sent out a pinnace to Narragansett for corn for the colonists; and the next year they went as far as Virginia on the same business; and on the return of the bark, "she came to Winysemett."¹ Why should she go to Winnisimmet instead of Noddle's Island, if Maverick's residence was there?

It is significant that though Wood's map, made not later than 1634, and the newly discovered Winthrop map of about the same date, both indicate a settlement at Winnisimmet, neither of them affords the slightest indication of any residence on Noddle's Island, which on the latter is represented as covered by forests. Nor does Wood, in his text, say more of Noddle's Island than to class it with Long, Round, Slate, Glass, and Bird Islands, which abound with woods, water, and meadow ground where the inhabitants pasture their cattle; but he states "that the last town in the still bay is Winnisimmet, a very sweet place for situation, and stands very commodiously, being fit to entertaine more planters than are yet seated."²

I have said that aside from Johnson there is absolutely no authority for saying that Maverick, or any one else, had a house on Noddle's Island in 1630. There are reasons for conjecture that such was the case until some time in 1634. Maverick sold part of his Winnisimmet estate to Bellingham in 1635, but he still had one hundred and fifteen acres left, now the United States Hospital grounds; and, as I conjecture, and as Wood's plan seems to indicate, his house was on that part. He acquired title to Noddle's Island in April, 1633, but, as we have seen, was at Winnisimmet as late as December of that year. He may have built on Noddle's Island in 1634. That is probable from the following facts: In July, 1637, Sir Harry Vane and Lord Ley dined with Maverick at Noddle's Island. He doubtless had a house there at that date. From May, 1635, to May, 1636, he was in Virginia; and that his house was built before he took that journey may be inferred from the fact that his wife, writing to Trelawny, dated her letter from "Nottell's Iland in Massachusetts Bay, the 20th November, 1635." Unless he built in the winter before going to Virginia, we are thrown back into the year 1634. And that it

¹ Winthrop's Journal, vol. i. p. 86: Dudley to the Countess of Lincoln.

² New England's Prospect, Prince Soc. ed., p. 44.

was not built earlier than that date is probable from the circumstance, already stated, that he was living at Winnisimmet in December, 1633.

But it is scarcely worth while to pursue the question further, when we have evidence which is clear and conclusive. The following extract from the newly found Maverick Manuscript ¹ settles the question : —

“ *Winnisime.* — Two miles Sowth from Rumney Marsh on the North side of Mistick River is Winnisime which though but a few houses on it, yet deserves to be mençond. One house yet standing there which is the Antientest house in the Massachusetts Goverment. a house which in the yeare 1625 I fortified with a Pillizado and flankers and gunnes both belowe and above in them which awed the Indians who at that time had a mind to Cutt off the English, They once faced it but receiveing a repulse never attempted it more although (as now they confesse) they repented it when about 2 yeares after they saw so many English come over.”

There is no ambiguity in the above statement. The house was fortified in 1625. Was it built then, or in 1623, when Thompson may have been in the Bay? If Maverick's statement, made May 30, 1669, that “it is forty-five years since I came into New England,” is to be taken strictly, he was not in the country before May 30, 1624; but neither this nor his other assertion, that “I have been here from the very first settling of New England by the English,” ² should be construed with literal exactness. Nor do I think we are to understand him as saying that temporary structures, such as must have sheltered the settlers at Wessagusset, were not erected before his palisade house at Winnisimmet. On the principal fact — that not later than 1625 he erected at Winnisimmet the first permanent house in the Bay Colony, and that the same was standing as late as 1660 — I think we may safely rest. Maverick could not have been mistaken in respect to anything so important in his personal history, nor had he any reason for misstating it. He certainly knew the facts of his own life better than Johnson, on whose sole authority all opposing statements are based. And Johnson's statement in regard to this matter, as well as to many other matters which may be supposed to have fallen under his observation, is coupled with

¹ *Ante*, p. 236.

² *Mass. Hist. Coll.* vol. xxxvii. pp. 317, 318.

assertions which we know to be untrustworthy. The historian of East Boston has discussed the question, Who was Mr. Maverick, of Winnisimmet? with considerable ingenuity; but the authority for his main assumption had not then been discredited by the Maverick Manuscript, nor does his discussion include the facts essential to the determination of the question.

Dr. ELLIS alluded to the recent death of the Rev. Dr. Blagden, who, having moved to New York, had been transferred from the roll of Resident Members to the Corresponding Roll.

Dr. PEABODY spoke warmly of the character of Dr. Blagden, having known him intimately for more than twenty years. At one time he was regarded as second to no one of his denomination in this region as a preacher. He was distinguished for soundness of thought, maturity of mind and judgment, and a comprehensive charity which was as large as the Church of Christ. There was wanting in him the sensational element which now is almost essential for a popular preacher. His professional services were prized; and some of his utterances, particularly in eulogy of those who had a kindred spirit to his own, were eloquent. He has left no memories but those of reverence and affection.

Dr. PAIGE followed in a similar strain, saying that for forty years they had both been members of this Society, and that he had always regarded Dr. Blagden as one of his special friends, and sincerely regretted his removal to New York.

A new serial, including the Proceedings for October and November, was laid on the table by the Secretary at this meeting.